



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/786,157	03/01/2001	Shigeaki Tamura	50070-063	4037

20277 7590 12/30/2004

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
600 13TH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

AU, SCOTT D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2635

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 09/786,157	Applicant(s) TAMURA, SHIGEAKI	
	Examiner Scott Au	Art Unit 2635	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): claims 6,9 and 11.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: 6,9 and 11.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,7,8 and 10.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument to the rejected claims are insufficient to distinguish the claimed invention over the cited prior arts to overcome the rejection of said claims under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as discussed below.

On page 6, second paragraph, Applicant's argument with respect to the invention of Utsunomiya fails to disclose or suggest "a first multilayer substrate" and "a second multilayer substrate" wherein at least one layer of the first multilayer substrate and at least one layer of the second multilayer substrate are electrically connected to a common ground", is not persuasive.

Referring to the rejection of claims 1,7 and 10, Examiner discloses that Yamamoto teaches a receiver (1) and controller (6) comprised of multiple integrated circuits and it's conventional in the IC art that the circuits are integrated on substrate to form a device; wherein the substrates of receiver (1) and controller (6) are electrically connected to a common ground (1B) (col. 3 lines 11-15; see Figure 1). Further more, Utsunomiya et al. suggest single and plurality circuits as an alternative to using single layer substrates may be manufactured on multilayer substrates (col. 4 lines 44-67).

Therefore, the fact that Yamamoto suggests the use of integrated circuits in a receiver and a controller that are tied to a common ground, one skilled in the art recognizes integrated circuits are conventionally formed on a substrate, and Utsunomiya teaches substrates for integrated circuits may be of a single layer or multilayer is what renders the claims obvious.

On page 7, second paragraph, Applicant's argument that Examiner failed to provide any motivation, is not persuasive. See the above motivation according to claims 1,7 and 10.

On page 12, paragraph one and two, Application's argument to the respect claims 6,9 and 11 that Yamamoto in view of Utsunomiya et al. and futher in view of Falbel failed to disclose the limitation that "wherein at least least one layer of the first multilayer substrate and at least one layer of the second multilayer substrate are electrically connected so as to exhibit a mirror effect for enhancing receiving of antenna connected to the receiver", is persuasive. Therefore, Examiner withdraws the rejection.

MICHAEL HORABIK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

